

Dison Rezone – Mr. Dison – First Meeting

Committee Present: Ken Kingshill-KK
Carolyn Stephenson-CS
Gloria Del Greco-GD

Planning Commissioners Present:
Brian Morales-BM

Petitioners Present: Mr. Dison-D

Staff Present: Al Salzman-AS
Jennifer Miller-JM
Ann Cavaluzzi-AC

Staff Issues

AS-Staff does not have any and has already recommended approval. Access to the site is via a dedicated public ROW.

Subcommittee Issues

CS-concern over access at 32 and the access road: width, proper signage, improvements made to corner, road

D-has volunteered to mow adjacent properties to provide clear vision but noted that the tree is on private property and he can not clear it

CS-would desire a stop sign on access road

AS-recommended speaking with INDOT or the county

GD-asked if the area was flat, confirmed by CS and D

KK-asked about property across the street, AS confirmed that it is a residence and welding shop

CS-asked about width, D confirmed that road is wide enough for two vehicles side by side and that it is a crushed gravel road

CS-asked about horses, D stated that he wanted to use the property as a horse boarding facility in the future should he decide to leave the nursery business

GD-asked about the location of the building, D confirmed it would be on the current pile of rubble, AS noted the 200' setback for any horse boarding facility

CS-asked about Surveyor's report, AS advised that with the zoning requested a report is not required, even if he should build a residence, CS-stated that the call to the Surveyor's

office costs nothing, AS confirmed if she wanted this contingent upon approval, CS said it was not, it was an FYI for the petitioner.

GD-asked about the removal of the debris and whether or not it was a Hazmat site, D confirmed that it was asphalt, concrete, and brick

D-this site is desirable given the location and surrounding landscape, they plan to plant 200-300 trees a year

AS-asked for a decision from the committee, D-asked about where to put the request in, AS noted to contact Hamilton County RC for a sign, but that it would not be something that was decided upon by the Town or Mr. Dison, D noted that traffic will be minimal roughly 3 trucks coming and going

CS-positive with the advisement to the PC that he was asked to HC Rd Dept
GD and KK-agreed

Petitioner Questions

Petitioner replied during Committee Questioning, AS advised petitioner to be at the PC meeting on October 23rd.

Mr. Dison excused himself at 8:35 pm.

Public Comment

none

Aurora PUD-CR White Development – Third Meeting

Committee Present: Ken Kingshill-KK
Carolyn Stephenson-CS
Gloria Del Greco-GD

Planning Commissioners Present:
Brian Morales-BM

Petitioners Present: Chris White-CW
Steve Hardin-SH
Kevin Todd-KT

Staff Present: Al Salzman-AS
Jennifer Miller-JM
Ann Cavaluzzi-AC

Staff Issues

AS-the sloped roof requirement is absent from PUD, but otherwise the overlay is very similar to Carmel, penthouse req and golden section??

Tab 14 the uses that relate to the Commerce Park area, max sq ft is absent form PUD
Tab 10-amenities, pedestrian path network in regards to rd realignment, why doesn't it go into the western area of the park and residential area

Tab 17 landscp buffer, pls clarify, exclusive or inclusive in lot area, shrub requirement removed, 202-203 vacation and access must be discussed with public works, the buffer around Heitman property is not sufficient, what was proposed was less than minimum in current ordinance-staff proposes increased depth and plantings

Subcommittee Issues

GD-why was special use district eliminated, CW concerns from neighbors due to ambiguity of possible uses made him decide to expand residential (with no increase to number of units)

KK-Tab E the max # of dwelling units (pg 3-5), confirmed that these are the max standards

GD-Fencing around businesses, will be on mound (tab 3 pg 2)? Masonry wall not less than 8' in ht, SH clarified that the masonry wall will start at front façade and wrap around side a portion of the way and will be continued with chain link to screen outside storage. CW/SH the chain link with wood slats has been removed and replaced with wood fencing

GD-same section pg 3, asked about gravel areas, CW clarified it is the storage area only, parking lane and travel areas will be asphalt and storage will have a solid wood fence

CS-are the intentions to have storage along 31, SH-no not allowed in business park

CS-with regards to buffering, will buffering be same around residential, CW stated that everyone seems to be interested in mounding (6')

GD-tab 5 pg 203, minim Open Space 10% of district? KK-of that district, Townes

GD-what is difference between towns and vistas, CW-vistas will be apartments

GD-under the towns in the elevation book, the garage orientation are a concern, CW-garages will not front main road, CS-they will be internal

KK-business parke and 31 overlay-min lot size of 2 ac which is not in overlay would like to see min 5 ac, SH noted that Carmel's overlay does not have the lot requirement, AS-noted this is not a staff concern as they try to balance the need/desire of community

KK-pics of business park are examples of architecture, but noted that we need to worry about the least common denominator

CS-concern about phasing with everything on the table in regards to residential, CW noted it would be moved up if need arose, CS noted that what was phase 1 and 2 is now all phase 1, CW pointed out that service to the area, won't be to the new phase 2 CS-said she would like to see some of phase 4 in conjunction with phase 1 and 2, KK-noted that the buffer was going in long before the "nuisance" exists and we may not have commercial for many years, SH stated that the builders they have talked with have indicated minimal impact on schools, KK and GD disagreed and asked how long the developments have been observed for impact after construction and asked where these people are going to work, SH noted that there is an econ incentive, KK agreed that there is a need to have a shovel ready site but complaints are in regard to the residential

AS asked how many acres??, CW roughly 100ac, 50% will be commercial industrial, AS noted that this proposal has the highest amount of commercial/industrial in the initial phase - more than other proposals now already approved, absorption rate for industrial and office in Westfield is slow and is not sure phasing is out of line

KK-availability of sewer line, assurance from Town Engineer sounded speculative, CW noted that there are existing sewers that could handle phase 1 and that every other currently proposed project depends on the new interceptor for complete build out

GD-article 10 amenities (pg 1 of 1)- increased 3 small parks but removed playgrounds, CW- product is aimed to attract empty nester not families

KK-the flag lot, we are hoping for a resolution, SH-offer has been made but no response back and have questions regarding buffer

Petitioner Questions

SH-appreciate buffer concerns, are proposing the same buffer being used for the Grassy Branch neighbors (6' mound with trees and shrubs per Town standards), 30' buffer along drive

SH-they will re-examine the missing standards

SH-tab 14, AS-concern on max sq ft, CW-will examine, SH-to avoid big box, AS-anchor tenants are kept at 65K for neighborhood business

SH-location of path tab D, CW the north was to provide access to the park, AS suggested to continue into vistas at south entrance and crossing at south end of park

CW-west homestead will have access easement to the new road

SH-shrubs in buffer requirement has been removed everywhere except where the buffer is abutting residential, AS-the comment was an evaluation of the standard

SH-vinyl slit fence removed for solid wood, the quad abutting Grassy Branch residents will be comparable to what was shown in pattern book, the residential facility for the mentally ill must remain in PUD but they are comfortable with removing, no accessory buildings for MF, amenity areas are not adjacent to buffer, continuous 6' mound wide enough to accommodate proper tree growth along Grassy Branch residents

AS-staff requested that PUD will remain static, any change will be held separate until PC reviews

KK-like com aspects generally, like standards appreciate the work and changes made to satisfy neighbors, biggest concern is the transitioning between all uses and proposal is not enough as well as Heitman property, recommendation to send a negative recommendation

CS-agrees with recommendation, without knowing more positives on com we don't believe we need more roof tops, would feel more comfortable with more commercial in phasing and need is for com not roof tops

GD-we need commercial not roof tops and community is not getting what is needed, CW-50% is not enough, GD- if it where more it would be better, there are good and bad parts can not give recommendation either way

SH- thanks for comments and work

Public Comment

none

Adjournment

9:15